

I have watched many debates between atheist and religious participants where scientists like Lawrence Krauss, Neil De Grasse Tyson, Richard Dawkins and Christopher Hitchens opposed different faith representatives. On atheist side I heard solid arguments. On religious side only rhetorics.

Atheism is defined as not believing in God. What is believing? It is accepting that which can not be proven - otherwise it would be called knowledge. If I do not accept someone else`s fiction I am an atheist? Ok. Milder terms are sceptic and agnostic. Consider me any of those three things. To make such a distinction between humans, sharing same air and physical characteristics, abiding to same cosmic laws, is an outrage. On contrary, I do not distinct people on the basis of their personal convictions. I distinct people on the basis of their intentions toward me which could be good or evil and I just reflect back in the same manner. Exactly in the same manner.

Why should I even know what is your personal conviction? I do know because you constantly promote your own faith by wearing specific outfits, exposing particular symbols and making gestures. It looks to me like competition of sort. You want to show that you are better than me because you are religious.

One of usual assertions made by religious debaters is that without God everything is permitted because there is no moral law. You believers need someone else to tell you what is right and what is wrong? You lack common sense, rationality and logic without imagined, subjective entity? Another issue is power given to the religious leaders and organizations.

One of the strongest "evidences" for God`s existence are holy scriptures. People believe in God because someone has wrote a sacred text thousands of years ago. How do you know that specific entity, allegedly communicating with authors, really is God? Isn`t it more plausible that entity was a higher specie, technologically advanced extraterrestrial civilization intending to distance humans from scientific development? Sort of alien counter-intelligence which obviously succeeded. Or religious circles could have subsequently forged received information to serve their particular benefit of manipulating the flock. While we had dark ages and inquisition - aliens were advancing their cosmic knowledge. While we were torturing witches and burning scientists - aliens were developing superior technologies.

While science works with the reality, faith representatives just move issue one step further: "Universe was created by God who is, per se, infinite and eternal". They explain one thing by introducing the second which is declared to be ultimate. How neat, but in the same manner we can introduce third or fourth instance et cetera ad infinitum - an infinite regress I always want to avoid.

"Per se" argument is invalid, first of all, because faith is system of a belief. This two mutually contradict. How can you believe in something that is known by itself? It has no sense. Do you believe or do you know?

Knowledge of God's existence is inserted into everything? We all belong to the Universe. We are all permeated by the spacetime underlying fields, energies and radiation. What we feel are the cosmic influences not God. Maybe, God is Universe. I accept that notion, partially, with other three possibilities for the origin being equally plausible: higher specie, simulation and Nature.

Debating "God" is beyond our human comprehension. It is solely an issue of metaphysics. Therefore it is not possible to disprove it but it is also not possible to do otherwise. Atheist position in this particular debate is to disprove something that has not been proven in the first place since God is merely a theological concept not more real than unicorn or fairy are in a fables. It has the same value as any scientific theory does. We may consider it to be one. Nothing more.

The true matter which must be discussed is why God concept was introduced at all. It was invented by those intellectually incapable to engage in science yet eager to impose their authority over others. Human kind had pharaohs and kings from dawn of the civilization. Pharaoh means "great house" in Egyptian. Does it refer to an alien spacecraft(s) visiting ancient Egypt or to their far away realms? It could easily be so. God concept is nothing more than tool for the subordination. When you see a holy person, object or symbol you must immediately kneel down and pray. Pray to Gods (aliens) not to become their prey? Maybe by praying we fuel alien vessels with psychic energy? One thing is certain without any doubt: by subordinating to the clergy we fuel their pockets.

Religious side will emphasize how many believers are among scientists. What kind of scientists are they? There are even those who claim to be both believers and philosophers at the same time. Decide. You can not be both. You are either accepting predetermined "truths" without scrutiny or you are exploring, contemplating and learning which means being a philosopher.

Sometimes quantity argument is used by religious debaters. They say that believers are more numerous than atheists. Let us take roulette, or any game of chance, like lottery for example. Are majority of numbers winning or there is just one winning number (minority)? Let us take another example. In the faculty room full of students with only one professor are students smarter because they are more numerous? Please do not use quantity argument due to its silliness.

The moment of religious acquaintance is very interesting: people are introduced to the religion from their earliest age - since they are babies - long before they are able to develop their character. Priest sprinkle babies with holy water declaring them of becoming a believer. Then they proceed by indoctrinating children through school faith class (catechism). Why don't you wait until they are fully grown? Oh, you must secure steady and unscrutinized influx of a new members into your congregation.

First chemical element formed in the Universe was Hydrogen. Then, by nuclear fusion, Helium and Lithium were created but when Supernovas bursted...

First angel created by God according to the Bible was Lucifer. Then God created Michael and Gabriel but after Lucifer was cast out of the Heaven...

Aren't this two stories, scientific and religious, almost the same "just" using different terminology? Hence, what we need is the proper justification.

Every scientific discovery is intentionally misinterpreted by religious circles and presented to believers as God's miracle with sole purpose of their deception and subordination.

Institutionalised religions are factories of concealment. When humanity finally dismantles their fraud we will collectively open our minds and enlighten ourselves as a specie.

To answer my question from the title: atheism vs religion debate - is there any?

There is none whatsoever.

There is only truth laying in between.